



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/677,146	09/30/2003	Terry M. Fletcher	884.B39USI	3927
21186 7590 12/11/2007 SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG & WOESSNER, P.A. P.O. BOX 2938 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402			EXAMINER FATAHI YAR, MAHMOUD	
			ART UNIT . 2629	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 12/11/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/677,146

Applicant(s)

FLETCHER ET AL.

Examiner

Mike Fatahiyar

Art Unit

2629

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 September 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 5-8, 10-19, 28 and 32-35 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 5-8, 10-19, 28 and 32-35 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 5-8, 10-11, 13, 15-16, 18-19, 28 and 32-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Millman et al(6,476,800B2) in view of Aldrich et al(2003/0201990A1).

Millman et al disclose a method and an apparatus comprising a graphic controller having a processor(204), a frame buffer(206), a mechanism for detecting a change in a power source from AC to DC power or from DC power to AC power and accordingly adjusting the refresh rate and/or updating a display property if a policy exist for the power management event(i.e., decreasing or increasing the pixel clock rate; see column 3, lines 28-67; column 4, lines 1-41; columns 5-7). Millman et al substantially show all the features of the above claims except for the "display property comprising at least one of screen resolution or a pixel depth". However, Aldrich et al is cited to show that the concept of increasing or decreasing a screen resolution or the number of bits-per-pixel for each of the three primary colors upon detection of a power mode/change signal is old(see abstract and paragraphs[0024 – 0032]. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Millman et al with the above noted

teachings of Aldrich et al such that to increase or decrease a display resolution corresponding to a detection of a power change event , such as from DC to AC or vice versa from AC to DC, because both references are related to updating a display property according to power changes for the purpose of power saving.

3. Claims 12 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Millman et al and Aldrich et al as applied to claims 1,10 and 23 above, and further in view of Brill et al(6,078,319).

Millman and Aldrich et al are discussed above. Brill et al is cited to show the relationship between resolution and/or pixel depth and the power supply in a computer system such that as the resolution and/or pixel depth of an image display increases the system would also increase the power supply higher and vice versa as the image display resolution and/or pixel depth decreases the system would also decrease the supplied power lower so that to save power consumption. Therefor, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply the above noted teachings of Brill et al to the modified system of Millman such that upon detection of a power supply change, for example, from AC power to DC power the processor decrease the pixel depth or vice versa upon detection of change from DC power to AC power the processor increase the pixel depth correspondingly because all the applied references are related to power saving for a computer display device.

4. Applicant's arguments filed 8/20/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicants in their remarks have argued that "Millman et al and Aldrich et al fail teach or show any specific element or elements in Millman that correspond with a policy, determining if a policy exists, or changing a display update property in accordance with a policy. Nothing in the cited sections of Millman, nor in Millman as a whole teaches or suggests the use of policies to control how and when a display update property is changed in response to a power management event". In response thereto, it must be pointed out the power source change detecting mechanism detects a change in the power source from AC to DC power or vice versa from DC to AC power their system automatically adjusts the refresh rate (i.e., decreasing or increasing the pixel clock rate)(see column 3, lines 28-67; column 4, lines 1-41; columns 5-7). This automatic adjustment is considered to be a predetermined existing power management policy for controlling how and when a display update property.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mike Fatahiyar whose telephone number is (571)272-7688. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 9:30 to 6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richard Hjerpe, can be reached on 571-272-7691. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Application/Control Number:
10/677,146
Art Unit: 2629

Page 5

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.
For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should
you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic
Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



RICHARD HJERPE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNICAL CENTER 2600

M. Fatahiyar *MF*

December 8, 2007